THE ARDRA.

Tejasvinavadhitamastu

Mavidvishavahai.

Taittiriyopanishad, I. ii. 1.

Enlightened be our learning,

let us not hate.

—Taittiriyopanishad, I ii. 1.

கதங்காத்துக் கற்றடங்கலாற்றுவான் செவ்வி
யறம் பார்க்கு மாற்றினுழைந்து.

— திருக்குறள், 130.

The God of right steps up to see the charm
Of him whom culture helps to conquer rage.

— Tirukkural, 130.

VOL. I. JAFFNA, MAY, 1933. PART 3.

THE GREAT VIKRAMADITYA AND THE NINE GEMS.

By J. C. De, Esq., M.A., B.L.

——o——

Tradition tells us that in days long gone by, there was a powerful monarch who ruled over a vast empire, who had his capital at Ujjayini, inaugurated an era which is still current, was the patron of the "nine gems", and who crushingly defeated

the Sakas. The victories over the barbarians which have been likened to those of the Europeans at Chalons and Tours (1) probably changed the course of the history of India and Ceylon, and endowed the monarch with prestige and glory which have outlived the ages.

Considerations of space do not permit me to go into the whole question here, and I shall be content with dwelling on only some of its salient aspects.

Attempts have been made by eminent scholars to throw doubt on the very existence of this king. Kielhorn, for example, argues that "the years of reckoning originally began in the autumn", and that autumn was the season when campaigns were normally fought in India. It was in fact, vikrama-kala, the season fit for waging wars (2) Against this Hoernle points out, and I believe, rightly, that an era is normally "called after a person, people or event, either actual or believed to be" real (3). Sten Konow goes further, and points out that a king of the Malavas must have inaugurated the Vikrama Samvat, in early times (4). Even if we think that the era began "Malavanam ganasthityah", it must be concluded that a definite event was connected with its inauguration. Fleet associates the introduction of the era with a powerful king (5). Prof. De writes, "The King Vikramaditya of Ujjayini was not only a great king and general, but he was like Harsha .....and Charles the Great ....a patron of letters" (6). The tendency of discrediting our ancient traditions, simply because they are traditions, and not because they are definitely disproved, has got to be resolutely combated, and it must

(1) Kalidasa and Vikramaditya, pages 6 and 7.
(2) Indian Antiquary Review, vol. XX, p. 407; vol. XXX, p. 4; Imp. Gazetteer, vol. II, p. 4. n. 2.
(3) Journal Royal Asiatic Society (Eng.) 1909, p. 100 and n. 1.
(4) Epigraphia Indica, vol. XIV, p. 294.
(5) Journal Royal Asiatic Society, 1913, p. 1000.
(6) Kalidasa and Vikramaditya, p. 26.

be borne in mind that historical traditions form to a large extent the basis of the ancient history of the world.

Hoernle made an attempt to collect the sources of this tradition, about twentyfour year ago (7). But he missed at least the two following verses from the Rajatarangini :-

Atha Pratapadityakhyastairaniya digantarat
Vikramadityabhubhartturjnatiratrabhyashicyata
Sakarir-Vikramaditya iti sambhramamasritaih
Anyairatranyathalekhi visamvadi kadarthitam (8).

The stranger, Pratapaditya, who was brought over to Kashmir was a relation (jnati) of Bhubhrt Vikramaditya. But the author warns the reader against confusing him with the traditional hero, the enemy of the Sakas. Accordingly, the victory over the Sakas was the distinguishing feature of Vikramaditya's political career, while at the same time, there existed a tendency to advance pretentious claims to that honour.

We must now notice that the verse,

·Dhanvanṭarih Kshapanakamarasimhasamku
Vetalabhattaghatakarparakalidasah
Khyato Varahamihiro nrpatessabhayam
Ratnani vai Vararucirnava Vikramasya,

which is well known in India and Ceylon, is undoubtedly spurious. If Candragupta II were the patron of Kalidasa, Varahamihira (c. 505 to 587 A. C) could not be his contemporary. Vararuci, as Prof. De points out, lived earlier than 150 B. C., and the Amarakosha of Amarasimha was "not improbably composed about 500" A. C. Further information can be gleaned from the references cited here (9).

(7) Journal Royal Asiatic Society. 1909, p. 104 etc.
(8) Rajatarangini, Cal. Edition, p. 15, V. 6 and 7.
(9) K & V. pages 26 to 28, Bharatke Pracina Rajavamsa (in Hindi) pages 393 to 400; Pathak's Meghaduta (1894) page 39.

The consensus of scholarly opinion points to Candragupta II as the patron of Kalidasa. I think that the theory is very probably correct. But I do not agree with Dr. Bhandarkar, Dr. Smith and Prof. De in thinking that he is identical with the traditional hero.

Firstly, though Ujjayini was very probably included in the empire of Candragupta II, it is nowhere mentioned that it was his capital. The Guptas, certainly called themselves, "Lords of the great town of Ujjayini". But this information dates back only to the twelfth century A. C. Again Patali (putra) also seems to be connected with them. There are good grounds for thinking that Kanauj (or Pataliputra) was the Gupta capital.

Secondly, I admit that Candragupta was the son of the great Samudragupta, that as a result of his dig-vijaya, Candra wiped out the principalities of a branch of the Sakas, and that he could thus lay claim to the proud title of the Sakari. He was the father of Govindagupta, the powerful Kumaragupta, Prabhavatigupta—the Princess—Regent of the Vakatakas, and also probably of Candraprakasa. The glory of his line certainly survived him Not only that, some of his coins definitely show that he assumed the title of Sri Vikrama and Vikramaditya. But he is not the only Gupta who could be regarded as possessing the requisite historical claims. Skandagupta's empire, for example, was probably as vast as that of Candra. Skanda defeated the Hunas, who were undoubtedly "barbarians". Some traditions point out that the victories of the traditional Vikramaditya were gained against the Mlecchas ("barbarians"). Skanda also, assumed the title of Kramaditya and Vikramaditya. How can we then say definitely that Candra and not Skanda was the traditional hero, even if our choice were limited to the rulers of the Gupta House?

Thirdly, the Vikrama Samvat is referred to as "Srirmala vaganamnate etc.," "........Malavapurvvayam", "Malavanamganasthitya yate etc.", "Malavaganasthitivasat kalajnanaya likhiteshu etc.,"and"......Malavesanam" (10). I may suggest here that the controversy over the word gana may perhaps be terminated, if the history of the Sinhalese ganasabha be diligently and carefully studied. The fact to be noted for our present purpose is that the Vikrama Era was connected with the Malavas, during the Gupta Period. Moreover, the Guptas had an era of their own which was adopted by powerful princely dynasties of the time; an era hallowed by the glories of a hundred conquests. Why then should the early Gupta Emperors try to inaugurate another era?

Some eminent scholars agree that we meet a Vikramaditya even in the first century B. C., when the Vikrama era actually begins. Bhandarkar's rejection of this tradition, simply because it is a tradition, cannot be supported. His argument based on Krishna and Radhika is not very strong, and may perhaps be met by suggesting that the passage might have been interpolated. Sten Konow as we have seen above is in favour of an early Vikramaditya (11).

At the same time, I may show on some future occasion, that there are grave objections against the identification of this traditional hero with Yasodharman of Malwa.

Our knowledge of early Indian and Ceylonese history is at present too imperfect to allow us to come to a definite conclusion. But it seems to be certain that till the middle of the eighth century A. C., the era, now known as the Vikrama

(10) Epi. Indica Vol. XII, p. 320; Corpus Inscr. Ind. Vol. III, No. 18 and No 35. Inscriptions in the Ajmer Museum etc.

(11) Epi. Indica, Vol. XII, p. 320; Indian Review, Dec. 1909; Bhandarkar Com. Volume, pp. 188 and 189 ; Epi. Indica Vol. XIV, p. 294.

Samvat, was connected with the princes of the Malavas. The full passage to which I referred above, runs thus:-

> Samvatsarasataih yataih sa-pancanavat
> yarggalaih saptabhirmmalavesanam.

The date is therefore 795 M. E. (expired), i. e. 739/40 A. C. Secondly, we find only in the middle of the ninth century, the passage,

> Vasu nava ashto varsha gatasya
> kalasya Vikramakhyasya. (12)

Here for the first time, we find the era referred to as the Samvat which is named Vikrama. Thirdly, Bhandarkar in the Commemoration Volume pointed out that (13) king Vikrama is found definitely associated with it, only as early as the middle of the eleventh century.

Fourthly, a cave inscription (which however is rather late in date) tells us that Candragupta preceded Vikramaditya. Fleet does not agree with Burgess in thinking that this Candragupta was the great Maurya (14). He may possibly have been Candragupta II.

Fifthly the Cambridge History is very probably right in pointing out that the Vikrama era was inherited by the Malavas from the Sakas who were their early overlords (15). In other words the inauguration is not connected with a powerful Indian monarch, the enemy of the Sakas.

On the whole therefore, I am tempted to suggest, though tentatively, that a powerful king who flourished in the ninth or tenth century A. C., and assumed the title of Vikramaditya got the prevalent era associated with his name, and tradition clothed him with some exploits of other monarchs of early Indian history.

(12) Indian Antiquary Review, Vol. XIX, p. 35
(13) p. 188.
(14) I. A. Vol. XIII, p. 185.
(15) C. H. I Vol. I, ix.

THE BASES OF PRONOUNS.

By Mr. C. N. Ananta-Ramayya Sastri, M.A.

The base of the Tamil cases, all except the nominative, is என் in the singular, one base being எம் in the plural, in the first person. எ denotes interrogation. It is connected with the Sanskrit யம் (*which*) which has only the signification of the relative pronoun, the interrogative pronouns in Sanskrit always beginning with *k*. The relative pronouns in Sanskrit beginning with *y* are a sure proof of the similarity of the genius of Sanskrit on the one hand and the Dravidian languages on the other. "Ya evam veda" (*whoever knows thus*) shows the antiquity of relative pronouns beginning with Sanskrit which are conspicuous by their absence in the European Aryan languages. E. g., Quae supra nos nihil ad nos (yaani upari nah taani nahi nah; *the things above us are nothing to us*)-Latin; quand les vices nous quittent, nous nous flattons de la creance que c'est nous qui quittons (when the vices us quit we ourselves flatter with the notion that it is we that are quitting them—*when our vices leave us, we flatter ourselves with the notion that we are leaving them*)—La Rochefoucauld in French; quanto la cosa e piu perfetta, piu senta il bene, e cosi la doglienza (*as the thing approaches nearer to perfection, the thing feels both pleasure and pain more acutely*)—Dante in Italian; que hacer bien es tesoro que se guarda para quando es menester (*a good action is a treasure stored up until the day of the doer's need*)—Calderon in Spanish; que inimiga nao ha tao dura a fera como a virtude falsa da sincera (*there is no enemy so fierce and cruel as is simulated virtue to that which is sincere*)—Camoens in Portuguese; wer dem Publicum dient ist ein armes Thier, er qualt sich ab niemand bedankt sich dafur (*the man who is the servant of the public is a creature to be pitied; he wears himself out, and nobody says "Thank you" for his pains*)—Goethe in German.

The English relative pronouns *who*, *which* and *what* (the relative pronoun *which* with its antecedent *that*) are connected

with the German word *wer* and the corresponding words beginning with *q* in the Romance languages.

The interrogative pronouns *who*, *which*, and *what*, which can also become interrogative adjectives are in the same way connected with Germanic and Romance languages. The interrogative adverbs *when*, *where*, *whither*, and the same used conjunctively, and *whether*, are in the same way connected with Germanic and other Aryan languages. The *h* in the English *wh* is found dropped in the German *wer* (who), *wenn* (when), *weder* (whether), and *welch* (what or which). Anglo-Saxon and English pronominal terms with *wh* and the interrogative *how* remind us, however, of Sanskrit pronominal substantives, adjectives and adverbs beginning with *k*. The *kva* of "Kva suryaprabhavo vamsah" is on all fours with the *quo* of "quo (vadis domini)" and "(status or statu) quo."

How interesting that Tamil pronominals with initial *y* correspond with Sanskrit pronominals with initial *y* and that these have no thoroughly counter parts, i. e., pronominals with initial *y* in High or Low German dialects and Romance ones!

யாவன், யாவள், யாது are certainly connected with எவன், எவள், எது, and the latter three forms are philologically earlier than the former three. எ joins adjectively with nouns as in எப்பொழுது, and as அ and இ in அப்பொழுது and இப்பொழுது and we have எந்த corresponding to அந்த and இந்த. ய which is a "திரிதல்" of எ in philology in my opinion does not go to make these forms.

Besides எது we have ஏது and so also we have short எ in the simple pronoun என் and ஏன் in the pronominal verb செய்தேன்.

I am humbly of opinion that the interrogative எ and ஏ, which became secondarily relative in significance, is at the bottom of the *first person* in the Dravidian languages.

என் through என் brought about யான். யான் literally means, then, the *individual who*. All Sanskrit forms connected with யத் in Sanskrit are also derivable from எ showing interrogation to begin with, and this fact would never see the light of day but for the Dravidian languages. *Yaan* can become நான் in Tamil and becomes ஞான் in Malayalam. *Nal-tinai* has யாயும் ஞாயும் to mean *my mother* and *thy mother*. I should think that ஞாய் literally meant *my mother* and came to mean *thy mother* in the context, which can be pronounced to be as elevated naturally and poetically as any in Tamil or Sanskrit. The change of ய into ஞ can only be said to have been more common in the Chera territory than in the other ones.

In Kanarese, நான் becomes நானு in prose. Telugu னேனு retains the interrogative-relative stem. [I have strong grounds for not transliterating the Kanarese word as நாநு or ஞானு and the Telugu word as நேநு or னேனு. Many would write "அநேகம்" while they write "ஆனந்தம்". "அனேகம்" is the better and consistent spelling. Sanskrit, Telugu and Kanarese have only one dental-nasal *n*, but that fact need not cause inconsistency in *Tamil* spelling!]

In the first person plural எம் through எம் became யாம் and நாம். In the oblique cases, colloquial Tamil employs only நம்மை, etc., in the plural, and not எம்மை, etc., whereas colloquial as well as classical Tamil employs only என்னை, etc., in the singular.

Among consonantal changes may be mentioned னேழு becoming மேழு in Telugu, and நாம் becomimg நாவு in colloquial Kanarese through a hypothetical நாழு.

Secondly, I wish to point out that the *demonstrative* உ is the first basis of the second person. உன் and உம், singular and plural respectively, correspond to the first person elements என் and எம். எம் through the intermediate hypothetical stage

யம் becomes நம். உம் need not become யும் but still straightway became நும் in imitation of நம் நின் of classical Kanarese, நீனு of colloquial Kanarese, நீ of Tamil and Malayalam, and Tamil verbal endings pertaining to the second person singular and plural, have all rejected உ and pursued இ and its equivalents. நின் is more classical than உன், but still உன், which has disappeared from Telugu, Kanarese, and Malayalam, was at the very bottom of the second person idea in my considered opinion.

In the Telugu second person singular நீவு, there is an accretion of வு. The colloquial Kanarese, second person plural is also curiously enough நீவு, it being the third stage of நீம், the classical Kanarese second person plural, the second and hypothetical stage being நீமு. நீவு, then, is neither plural nor honorific plural in Telugu. *Meeru* of that language corresponds to நீர் of Tamil and the change of *n* into *m* is exactly like that of the initial consonant in the first person plural form in the same language. The second *m* might have been responsible for the change in the first person plural form and (false) analogy or imitation of the first person plural form, for the change in the second person plural form.

We have seen that the interrogative-relative initial vowel is responsible for the *first person* and that the intermediate demonstrative initial vowel is responsible for the *second person* in the Dravidian languages. The rest is clear sail: அ and இ are employed in the third person pronouns according as distance or proximity is denoted. The eligibility of அ to denote distance, இ to denote proximity, and உ to denote a less distinct demonstrative idea including middle position, can be demonstrated in the face and illustrated by figures. I once mentioned this fact in a paper attached to my booklet *Hindu Mind* to show that *Aryan demonstratives* can be studied best along with Dravidian demonstratives, and there were discor dant replies from some Indo-European philologists. It is my

considered opinion yet that the departure is from uniformity to untowardness and not from untowardness to uniformity in the department of Aryan-Dravidian demonstratives — the uniformity being of course maintained by the Dravidian languages.

I-dam is the Sanskrit pronoun that affords astounding evidence of இ having been employed as a rule to denote proximity in Sanskrit and other Aryan languages. *Itah*, *Iti*, *Ittham*, *Idaaneem*—these four words form bulwarks for the protection of truth in this connection. *I-dam* is neuter. Its masculine form *Ayam* illustrates the departure from இ to அ for a change of gender, இயம் *Iyam* (she), however retaining the original idea of proximity to the core. In *Adas* with *Asau*, and *Atah*, the departure has been for less reason, though there is the excuse of uncertainty between proximity and distance. The uncertainty in the case of உ in the Dravidian languages has passed into the sphere of அ also in various Aryan forms.

THE ILLUSTRATION OF THE PRINCE BROUGHT UP AS A HUNTER.

(RAJAPUTRA—VYADHA—NYAYAH.)

BY MR. N. NARAYANAN

The following extract is taken from Colonel G. A. Jacob's Laukikanyayanjalih, Part II, pages 66 and 67.

" The illustration of *the king's son* [who was brought up] *as a hunter*. The story is that a young prince, abandoned by his parents at his birth, was adopted by a hunter and brought up as his own son. The boy remained in ignorance of his real origin until he was discovered by a kindly person and restored to his rightful position. Sankaracarya seems to have been the first to utilize the tale, and he gives it as follows in his bhashya on *Brhadaranyakopanishad* 2.1.20 :—

'Atra ca sampradayavida akhyayikam sampracakshate. Kascitkila rajaputro jatamatra eva matapitrbhyamapaviddho vyadhagrhe samvardhitah. So 'mushya vamsatamajanan vyadhajatipratyayo vyadhajatikarmanyevanuvartate na rajasmiti raja jatikarmanyanuvartate. Yada punah kascit paramakaruniko rajaputrasya rajasripraptiyogyatam janannamushya putratam bodhayati na tvam vyadho' 'mushya rajnah putrah kathamcidvyadhagrhamanupravishta iti sa evam bodhitastyaktva vyadhajatipratyayakarmani pitrpaitamahimatmanah padavimanuvartate rajahamasmiti ' (*a*).

(*a*) "And here, those who are acquainted with tradition narrate a story :— A certain prince, abandoned by his parents at his very birth, was brought up in a hunter's house. Ignorant of his lineage, and having only the understanding of a hunter by caste, he was simply pursuing the activities of the hunter-caste : he would not pursue the activities of the royal race, not knowing himself to be a king. When, however, a certain compassionate man, realizing that the prince deserved to attain to the prosperous state of a king, reminded him of his royal parentage by telling him that he was not a hunter, but was the son of such and such a king and that he had by accident got into a hunter's house, he gave up the understanding and pursuits of a hunter ; and, realizing himself to be a king, followed the course proper to himself, i. e., the course followed by his forbears".—Translated by me—N. N.

" Suresvara refers to this several times in his large Vartika. On page 71 we read :— 'Taccavidyanirasyeva vyadhabhavanayanjitah, rajasunoh smrtipraptau vyadhabhavo nivartate'. Then, on pages 970—2, he devotes ten verses to the nyaya, and returns to it once more on page 1845.

" The author of the *Siddhantalesa* (on page 20) cites it as the 'vyadhakulasamvardhitarajakumaradrshtanta', and it is reproduced, in a slightly different form, in the comments of Aniruddha and Vedantin Mahadeo on *Sankhyasutra* iv. 1. See also *Bhamati* 1.4.22. Raghunathavarman links with the above the *simhameshanyaya* which tells of a lion's cub being brought up as a ram; but I have not yet met with it elsewhere."

Elsewhere, it occurs in that extraordinary compendium of Saiva-Siddhanta, the Sivajnanabodha, which is probably anterior to Sri Sankara. This compendium consists of only 12 sutras, of which the 8th is as follows :—

Sthitva sahendriyavyadhaistvam na vetsiti bodhitah,
Muktvaitan guruna'nanyo dhanyah prapnoti tatpadam.

[" Having stayed in the company of the hunters known as the Indriyas (senses) you do not know who you are". Awakened to a knowledge of his identity thus, the fortunate soul—no wise different from the teacher—gives up these (the Indriyas) and acquires the guise of the Lord]

A short commentary attached to this verse concludes thus :—' Atreyam kathanusandheya: pura kila kascana rajasisuh pratibhatabhayadaranyam pravesitah tatranyaih pulindaih saha samvardhitah pulindamevatmanam manyamanah pascadagatena pitra na tvam pulindah tvam rajakumaro'si iti bodhitah jnapitah pascadrajapadam praptavaniti'. [This story must be introduced into the context : Once upon a time, a royal infant was sequestered in a forest for fear of the enemy's soldiers, and was brought up there in the company of hunters. He thus came to think of himself as a mere hunter.

Then his father came and made him understand that he was not a hunter, but a prince; whereupon, he acquired the status of a king].

The Tamil Sivajnanabodha, composed by Meikandan, contains the following corresponding sutra—

> " ஐம்புல வேடரில் அயர்ந்தனை வளர்ந்தெனத்
> தம்முதல் குருவுமாய்த் தவத்தினில் உணர்த்த; விட்டு
> அன்னிய மின்மையின், அரன் கழல் செலுமே".

[As the result of meritorious deeds wrought previously, the soul is instructed thus by its Guru (Teacher)—its own original: 'Having been brought up in the midst of the hunters called the five senses, you have forgotten your identity'—whereupon the soul gives up these companions, and, being not different from Hara, resorts to His foot].

The allusion is explicitly stated in a sutra of the later work—Sivajnana Siddiyar—composed by Arulnandi Sivacarya. It runs thus :—

> " மன்னவன் தன்மகன் வேடரிடத்தே தங்கி
> வளர்ந்து அவனை அறியாது மயங்கி நிற்பப்
> பின்னவனும் "என் மகன் நீ" யென்று அவரில் பிரித்துப்
> பெருமை யொடுந்தானாக்கி பேணுமாபோல்
> துன்னிய ஐம்புல வேடர் சுழலில் பட்டுத்
> துணைவனையும் அறியாது துயருறும் தொல்லுயிரை
> மன்னும் அருள் குருவாகி வந்து அவரில் நீக்கி
> மலமகற்றித்தானாக்கி மலரடிக்கீழ் வைப்பன்".

[Just as, while a prince, who has fallen among hunters and grown up in their midst, is living in utter forgetfulness of his own identity, his father the king approaches him with the words, 'you are my son'; and, separating him from the hunters, proudly makes him part and parcel of himself and tends him with kindness; so also the Lord, who is all Grace,

coming in the form of a Teacher, leads away the soul which, fallen into the vortex of the hunters called the senses, is ignorant of its guide and plunged in sorrow ; and, purging it of all impurity, makes it part and parcel of Himself, sheltering it beneath His blossom-like feet].

Whereas the Sankarabhashya speaks of the wilful abandonment of the prince by his parents and of his subsequent enlightenment by a merciful stranger, both the Sivajnanabodham (Tamil as well as Sanskrit) and the Sivajnanasiddiar speak of the abandonment as having been made under the stress of circumstances, and credit the king himself with the ultimate redemption of the prince. Moreover, in the Saiva Siddhanta, it is the Lord Himself who always appears as a Guru towards the last stage of illumination.

SITA'S WEDDING.

By Mr. G. K. PILLAI, B.A.

—o—

Behold the princely boy ! So proud of mien !
Erect, and sure, amidst the startled gaze
Of all the princes, princesses, ablaze
In robes of gold and jewels, of wondrous sheen,
Of varied hues : red, yellow, blue and green.
Up, he lifts the bow, of the olden days—
Enormous weight !—and as the legend says—
In Shiva's mighty grip, it last was seen.
He drew the string.........it was all the assembly saw.
A mighty crash ! The bow had broke in two
Limp, lay the string ! The Prince—he stood at ease !
"My heavenly stars ! my heart-strings did he draw !
I'm drunk with joy he has won—mine own lord true !"
And Sita's bosom swelled tumultuous seas.

SAINT MANIKKAVASAGAR
IN THE LIGHT OF CEYLON HISTORY.

BY MR K. KANAKASABAI, J. P., CROWN PROCTOR, JAFFNA.

Saint Manikkavasagar is the reputed author of Tiruvasagam and Tirukovaiyar. From a study of Tiruvasagam and Vataoorar Puranam, I venture to discuss certain incidents in his life, and place my conclusions before the public through the columns of the Ardra.

I may say that, as a Poet, Manikkavasagar has no equal in the Tamil world. He is a Master of the Art of *Sledai*, and it is this art which has given him his exalted position as the Poet Laureate of the Tamil world.

There are four incidents in his life, which I intend to discuss herein. They are (1) the blessing he had from a Guru at Peruntурai, (2) the appearance of horses before King Pandiya, (3) the play of some one on the banks of the river *Vaigai* and (4) the miracle of curing the dumb-child. I shall deal with these in their order.

He mentions Perunturai as the place of Guru-blessing. His Tasangam, Tiru Venba, and Pandaya-nanmarai, give details for the identification of this place and of the Guru. So far as the place is concerned, this part of his Venba in Tasangam, viz:—

வான்வந்த சிந்தை மலங்கழுவ வந்திழியு
மானந்தங் காணுடையா னாறு.

points to the river Palavy (பால்-ஆவி) of Matota. He speaks of a mountain as

நெஞ்சத்
திருளகல வாள்வீசி யின்ப மருமுத்தி
அருளுமலை யென்பது காணுய்ந்து —

I consider this as Keteecharam; நெஞ்சத்திருள் (கேதம்) அகல வாள்வீசி (ஈர்த்து)............... மலை (தரம்)-கேத-ஈர்த்-தரம்

(கேதீச்சரம்). Again note the mention of Patkadalan (பாற்கடலான்) referring to Palk Strait and Puravyoor (புரவியூர்) referring to the horses then landed by the sea-port of Matota. The following is another important mark of identification ;—

ஏற்றார்
அழுக்கடையா நெஞ்சுருக மும்மலங்கள் பாயுங்
கழுக்கடைகாண் கைக்கொள் படை ;

he refers to the Indian Ocean, Palk Strait and Gulf of Mannar, whose waters flow together in that place. The meaning of the verse is :—ஏற்று—ஆர் (எதிரில் தங்கும்) அழுக்கடையா(து) நெஞ்சுருக—மும்மலங்கள் (முந்நீர்கள்—Indian Ocean, Palk Strait and Gulf of Mannar) பாயுங்கழு(ழி)க்கடை compare with this கோகழி (நீர்க்கழி) referred to in several places, and the following :—

உள்ளமல மூன்றுமாய வுகுபெருந்தேன்
வெள்ளந்தரு பரியின்மேல் வந்த—வள்ளல்,

உள்ளமல மூன்றுமாய (as explained above) உகுபெருந்-தேன் (கன்றினை உவமைச்சிலேடை) வெள்ளந்தரும்-பரியின்மேல் வந்த வள்ளல் ; the translation is, one who is faster in alms-giving than the speed of the horses landed in that seaport of three waters. Lastly note the mention of palmyrahs by the word Tali (தாளி) and the praise given to the cocoanut cultivation of Matota in the whole of Tiruvenba. He begins first by saying, "I am here without taking the honey-sweet Senthi-cocoanut water (தேனுந்துசெந்தி)"; செந்தினீர் is a kind of young cocoanut of sweet taste. Then he speaks of it as (பரம்பரன்) spreading everywhere, with different kinds of cows (ஆர்க்கோ, அரற்றுகோ etc.) and giving a pleasant intoxicant (meaning toddy). In the third verse, he says that formerly he used to eat the ghee of the the cow, but now he has been using this (meaning cocoanut oil), வையத(மாட்டு) திருந்து-உறை (பால்கடைந்த வெண்ணெ) உள்வேன். The fourth verse says that this cocoanut tree of Perunturai (தென்னன் .... கருணையாளன்), which stands straight without

bending gives the curing medicine for diseases; முன்-னைவினை (வளைவு) இரண்டும் (இரட்டை) வேரறுத்து முன்னின்றான், பின்-னைப்பு (வளைவு) இறப்பறுக்கும் (பிணை நீக்கும்) பேரானை—தென்னன் (தென்னை)........ The 5th verse speaks of Siva as One *inside* Perunturai and that he resides within his mind and his tiffin is the cocoanut தின்று (சிறு உணவு). The 6th verse must be read as follows:—பித்தென்னையேற்றும், பிறப்பறுக்கும் பேச்சு—அரிதாம், and the meaning will appear clearly. The 7th and 8th verses need no explanation. The 9th verse disparages paddy cultivation :—

> மூவருமுப்பத்து மூவருமற்றொழிந்த
> தேவருங்காணாச் சிவபெருமான்—மாவேறு (வயலில விளங்கி)
> வையகத்து (வைக்கோலில்) ஏவு—அந்து (பூச்சி) இழிந்தவார கழல்கள்
> வந்து—இக்கமெய்யகத்து (வீடுசேர) இன்பு—அமிகும (குறையும்).

and the 10th and 11th verses state what is profitable cultivation :—

இருந்(சித்தக்) தென்னை—ஆண்டான் மரம்) இணையடியே சிந்தித் (நீர் சிந்தி)
திருந்து (திருத்தல்) இரந்துகொண்ணெஞ்சே எல்லாந்—தருவகாண்
பெருந்துறையின் மேயபெருங்கருணையாளன்(தென்னை)
மருந்துருவாய் (நெய்யாய்) என்மனத்தே வந்து (compare 3rd verse)

> இன்பம் பெருக்கியிருளகற்றி வெஞ்ஞான்றும்
> துன்பம் தொடர்வறுத்துச் சோதியாய்—அன்பமைத்துச்
> சீரார் பெருந்துறையான் (தென்னை) என்னுடைய சிந்தையே
> ஊராகக்கொண்டானுவந்து.

Thus, he praised cocoanut cultivation. In none of these *venba's* did Manikkavasagar say that God Siva appeared before him as his Guru, but clearly distinguished his Guru from God. And in my opinion he did so all along in Tiruvasagam, but exalted him as Siva to the naked eye by his ingenious art of *Sledai* coining.

Now, I shall deal with the second incident in his life, viz. the appearance of horses before Pandiya. The name of this Pandiya is mentioned as Varaguna in his Kovai. The Puranam says that hearing the cries of this Saint in imprisonment, GOD SIVA directed the jackals of the jungle to be transformed into horses, and he, seated on a horse like a horse-seller, and the Devas in charge of other animals, went before King Pandiya and delivered to him the horses and went away; and on the morrow at day-break all these horses took again their natural forms of jackals. The author only conveyed a traditional story, which had its growth amongst illiterate masses and sustenance amongst misguided men. Did Manikkavasagar proclaim to the world that any horses were transformed from jackals?

I shall deal with the verses which are supposed to allude to this story :—

This is one of them :—

இரும்புதருமனத்தேனை ஈர்த்தீர்த்தென்னென் புருக்கிக்
கரும்புதரு சுவையெனக்குக்காட்டினை உன்கழலிணைகள்
ஒருங்கு திரையுலவு சடையுடையானே நரிகளெல்லாம்
பெருங்கு திரையாக்கிய வாறன்றே யுன்பேரருளே.

The meaning of this verse is, in my opinion, as follows :—

....நரிகளெல்லாம்
பெருங்கு (பெருக்குக்) திரை ஆக்கிய—ஆறன்றே உன்பேரருளே ;

YOUR GRACE was shown on that day when the river was flooded and the land was thus made to overrun with jackals i.e. made desolate. The whole of the 7th verse of the Anandamalai hymn speaks of the flood only, and he concludes it with the question, what can I do for this? Therefore I say that it has nothing to do with Anandamalai, and that Anandamalai was completed with the first six verses. The 7th verse is,

நரியைக் குதிரைப் பரியாக்கி ஞாலமெல்லா நிகழ்வித்துப்
பெரியதென்னன் மதுரையெல்லாம் பிச்சதேற்றும் பெருந்துறையாய்
அரியபொருளேயவி நாசியப்பா பாண்டிவெள்ளமே
தெரியவரிய பரஞ்சோதி செய்வதொன்றுமறியேனே.

This appears to me as a most ingenious *Sledai* verse of the author, which might have originated the myth of the jackals having been transformed into horses. நரியைக்கு (பிரமிக்கும்) திரைப் பரி (வருத்தம்), அல்லது பரிபு (ஓட்டம்) ஆக்கி, ஞால—மெல்லாம் (கடிதல்) நிகழ்வித்துப் பெரியதென்னன் மதுரையெல்லாம்—பிச்சது (பைத்தியம்) ஏற்றும் (ஏற்றுகின்ற) பெருந்—துறையாய் (துறையுடையவனே), அரியபொருள்—ஏய (மேவிய) விநாசி (அழிவு) அப்பா (நீரே) பாண்டி வெள்ளமே, தெரியவரி-அபரம் (பிற்பக்கம்) சோதி (சோதிப்பானே)......

Now, I take another verse which appears to speak of குதிரை, Pandipatigam 2:—

சதுரை மறந்தறிமால்கொள்வர் சார்ந்தவர் சாற்றிச்சொன்னோம்
கதிரை மறைத்தன்ன சோதிகழுக் கடைகைப்பிடித்துக்
குதிரையின்மேல்வந்து கூடிடுமேற் குடிகெடுகண்டீர்
மதுரையர் மன்னன் மறுபிறப்போட மறித்திடுமே.

The meaning of this is:—

சதுரை (வேதத்தை) மறந்து-அறி (காணும்) மால் (மயக்கம்) கொள்வர்-சார்ந்தார் (திண்ணையிற் சார்ந்தார்) சாற்றிச்சொன்னோம், கதிரை மறைத்து-அன்ன (போன்ற) சோ (மதில்) திகழுக்கடை (திகழ்கின்றவாயில்) கைப்பிடித்து-உக்கு (சொரிகின்ற) திரையின்மேல் வந்து கூடிடும்-மேற்குடி (மழை) கேடுகண்டீர், மதுர-ஐயர்-(மன்னன் வேதம்) மறுபிறப்போட மறித்திடுமே.

Thus it speaks of Vedas and flood and has nothing to do with horse (குதிரை). Lastly take the verse in Tiruvammanai:—

.... பெருந்துறையான்
கொற்றக் குதிரையின்மேல் வந்தருளித் தன்னடியார்
குற்றங்கள் நீக்கிக் குணங்கொண்டு கோதாட்டிச்
சுற்றிய சுற்றத்தொடர் வறுப்பான.........

The meaning of this is a reference to flood. கொல்-தக்கு-திரையின்மேல், and it does not mean horse (குதிரை), as the myth does not indicate any victory by the horses. Thus, I am of opinion, that the word திரை was all along used, through this ingenious art of *Sledai* coining, to have the appearance of குதிரை (horse).

Now, I take the words மா, பரி and புரவி. In Pandipatigam the word பரி or புரவி refers to the horse of King Pandiya. In Kuyil Pattu, நற்பரிமேல் வருவானை, the word பரி means "elevated place"; தாவிவரும் பரிப்பாகன், the word பரி means சுமை and the meaning is, one who coming with rapidity, eases the burdens of his devotees. The word மாவேறி in Tiruvenba, I have explained as meaning paddy field. In some places the word பரி appears to have been used to denote (பரிவேகம்) the speed of a horse. See Pandayananmarai, பரிமேல் வந்த வள்ளல், one who has exceeded the speed of a horse in alms-giving; and Ponnusal, ஞாலமிகப் பரிமேற்கொண்டு நமையாண்டான், with a similar meaning for பரி. In Annaipattu, பாய் பரிமேற்கொண்டு means taking the mat and pillow (பாயும், பஞ்சும்); and note that the word பரிபாகன் (protector) appears in Pandayananmarai and not பரிப்பாகன் (keeper of horses). Thus, I find that this story cannot be supported by the occurrence of these words in Tiruvasagam, though the author has, by his *Sledai* use of these words, given room for the growth of such a myth.

Now, I come to the play on the banks of the river Vaigai. This story has been confirmed by Manikkavasagar, but still makes the superficial reader to understand that GOD SIVA was the player. The important verse is:—

பண்சுமந்த பாடற்பரிசு படைத்தருளும்
பெண்சுமந்த பாகத்தான் பெம்மான் பெருந்துறையான்
விண்சுமந்த கீர்த்தி வியன் மண்டலத்தீசன்
கண்சுமந்த நெற்றிக்கடவுள் கலிமதுரை
மண்சுமந்து கூலிகொண்டக் கோவான் மொத்துண்டு
புண்சுமந்த பொன்மேனி பாடுதுங் காணம்மானாய்.

By this verse he describes the player by *Sledais*, applicable to his Guru as well as to GOD SIVA, and therefore this verse cannot be taken as indicating a sole application to SIVA. The first part, I may say, is more appropriately applicable to his Guru; the meaning is, that Mahatma of Perunturai, who has that charitable disposition of a woman singing songs to the admiration of those to whom she has served meals: படைத்து, பண்சுமந்த பாடற்பரிசு-அருளும் பெண்சுமந்த பாகத்தான் பெம்மான் பெருந்துறையான்; the third line is equally applicable to SIVA and the Mahatma as the word ஈசன் means both; the fourth line also is applicable to both, as the word கடவுள் means both; but a very ingenious *Sledai* use appears here (கண்சுமந்த நெற்றி) and not நெற்றிசுமந்தகண் which is only applicable to GOD SIVA and might have been used if GOD only was meant by it. The other verses on this topic apply more to his Guru than to GOD SIVA;

> திண்போர்விடையான் சிவபுரத்தார் போரேறு
> மண்பால் மதுரையிற் பிட்டமுதுசெய்தருளித்
> தண்டாலே. பாண்டியன் றன்னைப்பணிகொண்ட
> புண்பாடல் பாடிநாம் பூவல்லிகொய்யாமே.

The first line is clearly applicable to his Guru; it is not respectful to use such words with reference to GOD. Note the *Sledai* meanings in தண்டால் (தண்டல்) *begging* as well as *club*. Also compare the verse பிட்டு நேர்படமண்சுமந்த பெருந்துறைப்பித்தனே சிட்டனே.......... ..சிவலோகனே.........which is solely applicable to his Guru; and note also that the Patigam, where this verse occurs has the head note of Curutarisanam (appearance of Guru).

Lastly I come to the question, where did the miracle take place, of making the dumb-child speak? The "Ancient Jaffna" of Mudaliyar Rasanayagam points out, quoting Nikaya Sangrahava, that an ascetic clad in the robes of a priest converted King Sena I of Ceylon to Hinduism. The Puranam says that the conversion of a King of Ceylon took

place in Tillai and associates with that event the miracle of the King's child being gifted with the power of speech. But Manikkavasagar in his Tiruvarttai says that this speaking of the dumb-child took place in Ceylon:—

பந்தணை விண்டறநல் குமெங்கள் பரமன்பெருந்துறை
யாதியந்நாள்
உந்துதிரைக் கடலைக்கடந்தன் றோங்குமதி லிலங்கையதனிற்
பந்தணைமெல் விரலாட்கருளும் பரிசறிவாரெம்பிரானாவாரே.

Compare also Kuyilpattu verse which says also that the power of speech was given by the Lord of Peruntural to the dumb-child:—

ஆர்கலிசூழ் தென்னிலங்கை யழகமர் வண்டோதரிக்குப்
பேரருளின்ப மளித்தபெருந் துறைமேயபிரானைச்
சீரியவாயாற்குயிலே தென்பாண்டி நாடனைக்கூவாய்.

In my opinion வண்டோதரி must be taken to mean வண்டோ-அதரி and not வண்டோ-உதரி, the wife of the valiant Ravana. Also make a note of the words பேர்-அருள்-இன்பம் and சீரியவாயால் and the reference will appear clearly. Thus, I have come to the conclusion that this miracle took place in Ceylon and the dumb-child was the child of King Sena I, and that the period of the life of this Saint began approximately about 1100 years ago, as Nikaya Sangrahava gives the period of the reign of Sena I from 819-839 A.D.

CORRESPONDENCE.

---o---

(i). TAMIL AND SOUTH INDIAN BRAHMINS.

Copies of the following letter were sent to a number of responsible gentlemen in South India:-

AUM.

N. Narayanan, B. A., B. L., L. T.,
Professor of Sanskrit.

The Jaffna Hindu College,
Vannarponnai(Ceylon),
3rd April, 1933.

Dear Sir,

The 11th anniversary of the Jaffna Oriental Studies Society was held here on the 1st and 2nd of April under the Presidentship of a Mr. Kathiresan Chettiar of Mahipalanpatti, Ramnad District, South India. In the course of his remarks on the morning of the 1st, he said that the Brahmins of South India as a class were suppressing Tamil and favouring Sanskrit. He added that, in the Universities of both Madras and Annamalai, the Brahmins were so powerful and so strongly opposed to Tamil that it was impossible for Tamilians to get anything done for improving the status of their mother-tongue.

The next morning, April 2nd, I was put down for a lecture on "Manu and Kural". In opening the subject, I contradicted the Chairman's remarks of the previous day by saying that Brahmins also were Tamilians, that their mother-tongue also was Tamil, and that, during the last sixty or seventy years, among the people of South India, the Brahmins had taken a leading part in elevating the status of Tamil. I tried to prove this by mentioning the names of Mahamahopadhyaya V. Swaminatha Iyer, Messrs. K. V. Krishnaswami ayyar and T. M. Krishnaswami ayyar of the Madras Bar, the Pandits Raghava Iyengars of Ramnad, Mr. Tirunarayana Iyengar of the "Sendamil", the late Mr. V. Krishnaswamy

Iyer (mentioned by the Chettiar himself at an earlier stage) and of several others. I also tried to prove it by saying that the modern Editors of the Sangam works known as the Ettuttogai and Pattuppattu were all Brahmins—except the Editor of the first edition of the Kalittogai, the late Mr. C. W. Thamotheram Pillai, who was not a South Indian at all but a Jaffna gentleman.

In commenting on my speech, the Chairman said that, when he accused the Brahmins of South India of suppressing Tamil, he did not mean the few good men who had made themselves well known to the public and with whom he had moved very much more intimately than I had or could have done, but the thousands and millions of other Brahmins whose names he could not mention as it was bad policy to do so. He again referred in particular to those Brahmins on the Governing Bodies of the Universities of Madras and Annamalai who were, according (as he said) to the information given him by Mr. Swaminatha Iyer himself, staunch opponents of Tamil. He also mentioned the name of the late Mr. P. T. Srinivasa Iyengar as that of a person who had once branded Tamil as an erotic language before a very learned and respectable audience at Madura, though, towards the end of his life, he became a convert to the real beauties of Tamil.

These remarks of the Chettiar were punctuated with loud applause, which showed that he was making a mischievous impression on the audience. If true, they cast a most damaging slur on the character of the Governing Bodies of the two Universities concerned. If false, they constitute a most malicious libel and must be contradicted and exposed as promptly and emphatically as possible.

Under these circumstances, I would request you to be so good as to cause the matter to be taken up before each

of the Universities in question, so that the public over here may know the real truth about it. I shall also be thankful for any light that you may personally be able to shed on it.

Awaiting an early reply to this communication,

I am,

Yours in Service,

N. Narayanan.

---o---

From the answers received, two are given here as specimens:-

(1)

S. SATYAMURTI,
Advocate

2/18, Car Street,
Triplicane
Madras, 14. 4. 1933.

Dear Mr. Narayanan,

Your letter and the copy of the ARDRA. Many thanks. I wish you all success.

The charge against the Brahmins that they are opposed to Tamil is false and malicious. It is part of the usual anti-Brahmin campaign. It is based on the ignorant assumption that a man cannot love both Sanskrit and Tamil. One must, according to these critics, hate the one or the other. For myself, I love them both, as my mother and father. I have said so publicly. I have been and am on the Syndicate of the Annamalai and Madras Universities, which are doing as much as they can, for the encouragement of Tamil and Sanskrit. Indeed I believe that Tamil cannot be revived without encouraging Sanskrit. I refuse to hate Sanskrit, while loving Tamil. That is the head and front of my offence. The Annamalai University is running an Honours course in Tamil—a unique feature—recently awarded a prize of

Rupees One Thousand only for a Text-Book on Logic in Tamil, teaches Tamil under part 2 of the Intermediate and the B. A. courses, and has a Tamil Department training students for the Vidvan and *Trained Teacher's Certificate* Examinations. The Madras University is also doing a good deal for Tamil; it maintains a Tamil Research Department, is publishing the Tamil Lexicon at a cost of nearly six lakhs of Rupees and gives Tamil an honoured place in its curriculum of studies. "Who dares do more is none".

Yours sincerely,
S. Satyamurti.

(2)

Mahamahopadhyaya
V. SWAMINATHAIYAR,
Madras.

உ
சிவமயம்.

Tyagaraja Vilas,
Tiruvettiswaranpet,
Triplicane, 15-4-1933.

அன்புள்ள ஐயா,

தாங்கள் இரண்டுமாதங்களாக ஆங்கிலப் பத்திரிகையின் இதழ்கள் இரண்டு வரப்பெற்று அவற்றிலுள்ள அரிய விஷயங்களைப் படிக்கச்சொல்லிக்கேட்டு ஸந்தோஷமடைந்தேன்.

சென்ற மாதத்து இதழுடன் அனுப்பிய அச்சுக்கடிதத்தையும் பெற்று அதிலுள்ள விஷயங்களை யறிந்து கொண்டேன்.

சில தினங்களுக்கு முன்பு அங்கே ஒரு சங்கத்தின் வருஷ பூர்த்தியில் அக்கிராசனம் வகித்த செட்டியாரவர்கள் தமது பிரசங்கத்திற் கூறியதாகத் தாங்கள் குறிப்பிட்டிருக்கும் அபிப்பிராயங்கள் மிகவும் விபரீதமாகவேயுள்ளன. ஆனால் அதேவிதமான கொள்கை நாடெங்கும் நிரம்பிய இக்காலத்தில் தாமும் அவ்வாறு சொன்னால் எல்லோருக்கும் திருப்தி யாயிருக்குமென்றும் மிக்க கௌரவத்தையடையலாமென்றுங் கருதி அங்ஙனம் கூறியிருக்கலாமென்று எண்ணுகிறேன். பாஷாபிவிருத்தியைப் பற்றிச்சொல்ல வேண்டியவர் இங்ஙனம் கூறியது பொருத்தமாக இல்லை. அண்ணாமலை யூனிவர்ஸிடி ஏற்பட்டது முதல் அதில் எனக்கு ஒரு விதமான சம்பந்தமுமில்லை. எனக்குத் தெரிந்தவரையில் சென்னை யூனிவர்

ஸிடியில் அதிகாரம் வகித்த ஒரு வகுப்பார் அவர் கூறியபடி தமிழைக்கெடுத்து விட்டார்களென்று சொல்வதற்கில்லை. மற்றொரு யூனிவர்ஸிடியிலும் அவர்களுக்கு மற்றவர்களைக் காட்டிலும் அதிக அதிகாரம் இருப்பதாகவும் தெரியவில்லை. அவர் கூறியபடி ஒருவகுப்பினரைப்பற்றிக் குறைவாக அவரிடம் சொன்னதாக எனக்கு ஞாபகமில்லை.

பொதுவாக, படிப்பவர்கள் குறைந்து வருகிறார்களென்றும், பாஷையில் அபிமானம் இக்காலத்திற்குறைந்து வருகிறதென்றும் சொல்லியிருக்கலாம். ஒருவகுப்பினரைப் பற்றிக்கெட்ட அபிப்பிராயமுண்டாகும்படி அவரிடம சொல்வதற்கு ஒருகாரணமுமில்லை. ஏதோ தாம் சொன்னதற்கு அநுகூலமாயிருப்பதற்காக என் பெயரைச் சம்பந்தப்படுத்தினார்போலும். இம்மாதிரியான விஷயங்களில் என் மனம் சிறிதும் செல்லாது. ஆயினும் அவசியமாதலின் மேலே கண்ட விஷயங்களை எழுதலானேன்.

இங்ஙனம்,

அன்பன்

வே. சாமிநாதையன்.

True translation of the above Tamil letter:—

Dear Sir,

I received the two parts of the English Magazine which you sent me in two months and was delighted to hear their valuable contents read out and explained to me.

I also received the printed letter sent along with last month's issue and acquainted myself with its contents. The opinions which you point out as having been expressed in the course of his lecture by Mr. Chettiar who presided, a few days ago, at the anniversary of some society there are, indeed, most perverse. But I think it likely that he has expressed himself in that strain under the impression that, in these days, when a doctrine of the kind is prevailing everywhere in the land, he can, by speaking so. please all and win great honour to himself. Such a speech is entirely inopportune on the part of one whose function was to deal with the promotion of language—studies. I have had no connection whatever with the Annamalai University ever since it was founded. So far as I know, there exist no grounds for the statement made by

him that any one specified section on the Governing Body of the Madras University has spoiled Tamil. In regard to other Universities also, it does not appear that the section referred to by him is more powerful than others. I have no recollection that I spoke to him disparagingly, as he says, of any one community in particular.

I might have told him generally that the number of people devoted to learning is decreasing, and that attachment to the mother-tongue goes on diminishing in these days. I can see no reason whatever why I should have spoken to him of any particular community in such a way as to create in him a prejudice against that community. It looks as though he has dragged my name into the context just for the sake of adducing some support for what he stated. My mind can never travel along these lines. However, necessity has forced me to commit the above things to writing.

Your loving friend,
V. Saminathaiyan.

We do not wish to make any comments on the correspondence or provoke a controversy over it. We have only to state, with all the emphasis we can command, that we have absolutely no personal interest in the matter, and that we have done little more than attempt to get some light thrown upon it. Now that this has been done, we ring the curtain down.

Editor, ARDRA.

(ii) THE KALAVU MARRIAGE OF THE TAMILS.

P. S. Sivasamy Aiyar. Manojna Vilasa,
Tuticorin, 20—4—33.

My dear Narayaniah,

In the article "Kalavu marriage of the Tamils", you (a) bring out beautifully the prominent features of such marriages as opposed to karpu variety. The Tamil poet addresses the நான்மறைவிரித்து நல்லிசை விளக்கும் வாய்மொழிப் புலவர் on the charms of love. It was well-known மறையோர் would not

(a) [Obviously, our corespondent has asssumed that we have ourselves written the article—Ed. A.]

commend இயல்பு (natural) unions except in rare cases of Rajarshis' daughters. It is not strange that மறையோர்'s (Girvani) வாய்மொழி poems are in contrast with the Bhasha poems and they (மறையோர்) occasionally come in for criticism at the hands of nature poets. Does not Kalidasa humorously allude to Narayana Rishi, father of Urvasi, as Vedabhyasa Jada in Vikramorvasiyam?

It is the moderns that make wrong inferences. Modern Tamilists forget that Tamil is a regional language like Marathi, Telugu, Guzarati etc, and each of these regional languages can have its own poets extolling regional institutions suited to its own natural surroundings.

I think the traditional view is the most correct in these matters. Sanskrit is a non-regional language developed and maintained chiefly for establishing man's communion with Higher Powers (Devas) through various injunctions, Samskaras, enjoined in the Vedas, Smritis, Itihasas, Puranas, Mimamsas etc. Kavyas in Sanskrit have been conceived as an instrument, to popularise the Vedic Achara, resembling the approaches of the Beloved (Kanta Sammita) and not to extol ordinary charms of life but to transmute them into divine. In contrast with the above, the aim of the Desa-Bhasha poems would appear to be to cultivate visible worldly existence to perfection.

Viewed from this standpoint, there is nothing to indicate difference in racial types between the Tamils and northerns, but perhaps there is something to point to different cultural types by reason of the emphasis on visible worldly aspects of life as distinguished from மறையோர்'s emphasis on the Adrishta side.

Yet மறையோர் and Tamils are one in race and so are Tamils and northerns.

Yours sincerely,
P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer.

[The views of our correspondents do not necessarily represent our own—Ed. A.]

BOOK REVIEWS.

—o—

The Swan Messenger—A Dramatic Poem, by G. K. Pillai: Arthur H. Stockwell, Ltd., 29, Ludgate Hill, London, E. C, 4. 48 pages : price not stated.

We are glad to welcome this second brochure of poetry from the pen of Mr. Pillai. It deals with the immortal story of Nala and Damayanti cast into the form of a dramatic poem. With its vigour, its swift and spontaneous movement, its animated dialogue, and its striking changes of scene and situation, it satisfies the essential conditions of a dramatic tale. It also reveals the author's confident command of the Spenserian stanza, which seems to answer his purpose quite well. Its poetic value may be assessed from, among other things, the very fine pieces of description which lie scattered through it—as witness the following from page 11:—

Like lotus flowers, came showering from above,
Soft gliding down, descending from the sky,
A bevy of milk-white swans, then 'gan to move
In graceful, rhythmic, steps, now there, now nigh,
About the garden grounds, greeting the monarch's eye.

But we are constrained to believe that the writer has a sneaking affection for the conceits of later Oriental poetry, for we cannot otherwise account for the intrusion of the following figures of speech into a poem which, in its Sanskrit original in the Mahabharata, is characterized by an exceedingly severe simplicity and artless beauty :—

One only want it had—the want of care!
No darkness there, except in maiden's hair;
The only bending thing was maiden's brow (page 10).

In its dramatic aspect, we may note that the meeting of Nala-Vahuka with his children (pages 44 and 45) is pitched in

a highly pathetic key, which, however, owes nothing of its impressiveness to artifice.

That the work is not a mere translation does not, perhaps, need to be specifically stated. No less in substance than in style it has an obvious originality and individuality of its own, which clearly distinguish it from its prototypes in both Sanskrit and Tamil. We wish that, for the aesthetic effect of his verse, the writer depended more and more on these qualities than on the conceits of the ancients; for, however pretty and genuine these conceits might have been in their own days, they appear absurd and ridiculous to modern students of literature—even though they be but Orientals. We also wish that the writer had avoided the use of such queer spellings as *Karkodog*, *Rithuburn* and *Vagu*, for *Karkotaka*, *Rituparna* and *Vahuka* respectively. These minor faults apart, the poem shows unmistakable marks of talent, and of the instinctive judgment and thoughtful care of the true artist.

மாணிக்க வாசகர் சீவிய சரித்திரம். ஆக்கியோன் யாழ்ப்பாணம் கதிர்காமர் கனகசபை *(J. P. & Crown Proctor, Jaffna). 13 pages: price not stated. Copies may be had from the author.*

In this short pamphlet, the author has sought to throw new light on certain aspects of the life and works of St. Manikkavasagar. The following may be mentioned among them :—1. The place called Tirupperundurai, where the Saint received his initiation, is identical with Matotta in North Ceylon. 2(a). The Hindu Saint who is described in some Ceylon chronicles as having visited Ceylon and converted a Ceylonese king to Saivaism, was no other than Manikkavasagar; (b) the king was Sena I; and (c) the period was 1100 years ago. 3(a) The guru of the Saint was not Lord Siva, as ordinarily supposed, but a human Mahatma; this Mahatma was also responsible (b) for the episode in which Siva is said to have presented foxes in the guise of horses to the Pandyan king

under whom the Saint was serving, and (c) for helping, as a boy-cooly, the helpless old female pittu-vendor of Madura in stemming the floods of the Vaigai, when he got beaten for his pains.

The "Udyanapatrika"—a Sanskrit Monthly, published by Mimamsarnava D. T. Tatacharya Siromani, M. O. L., Trivadi. Annual subscription, Rupee One only, with Tamil supplement Rs. 1-6-0, with Sanskrit supplement Rs. 2 0-0, with both supplements Rs.2-6-0. Vol VI, Parts 1 to 6, September 1932 to February 1933.

This admirable Sanskrit Journal, which is now in the 6th year of its publication, has been doing yeoman's service in the cause of Sanskrit culture. It is being edited by a board of highly competent scholars, and is, on the whole, a model of what modern critical Sanskrit scholarship should be. Its special mission is to expose the fallacies of Vedic and Shastraic interpretation, brought into vogue by a certain type of Western Orientalists, to whom some of our own men, unfortunately, yield unquestioning obedience. In this connection, we read with particular pleasure the lucid editorial (?) comments on the meaning of the word "Kasmai" in "Kasmai devaya havisha vidhema" (Rigveda, X, 121, passim). Among other things of interest in the half-yearly volume before us, we must especially mention Mr. A. V. Gopalachariar's illuminating comparative study of Kalidasa's *Meghaduta* and Vedanta Desika's *Hamsasandesa*.

[Readers of the ARDRA will perhaps, find it interesting to be told about the circumstances under which the Patrika was brought into existence and nourished in its early days. The following is a translation of what its editor says in Vol. I., Part 4, of the magazine:-

SUPPORT TO THE PATRIKA.

Sanskrit must be developed. This is our highest aspiration. Let it involve tremendous labour: let there arise hundreds of

obstacles: even then, as we have every moment been strongly making up our mind, we ought not to forsake our endeavour in that behalf. On the other hand, a heavy anxiety grows in us at every step. It assails our heart violently. It roots out even the courage which we have summoned with an effort.—Many of our Pandit-friends do not display sufficient interest and enthusiasm in the development of Sanskrit.

Sanskrit expects the help and industry of all in the cause of its development—of rulers, lords, commons, Pandits and pupils. The initiative in the matter is expected to come from Pandits. It is they who should first of all understand the present state of Sanskrit: they should consider why it is so: they should, again, come to a decision as to what should be done to make it prosper. They should realise the calamity that will ensue in the event of the ruin of Sanskrit and the benefit that will result from its prosperity. So long as Pandits do not act thus, we cannot hope for the progress of Sanskrit.

We desire to make all this known most emphatically to every Pandit. But is it possible for us to approach every Pandit and tell him the whole of it face to face? Or is it possible for us to do what can be done only at an enormous cost, viz., to bring about a conference of all Pandits at one place? If these two courses, then, are impossible, what is the third course by which ideas may be exchanged? Therefore, we thought thus:—Let us begin a journal; all our friends who are conversant with the ways of the modern world will give it their unstinted support. The heart of every one is overflowing with zeal to foster the growth of Sanskrit. If it gets an opening, it will gush out in torrents. Then the thunder of the Pandits—pealed out with one voice—will automatically reach the ears of all in the world, and the time will come, sooner or later, for the renaissance of Sanskrit.

How difficult it is to start a journal! Where is that wealthy scholar who, without looking for outside help, can embark

upon such a venture? For a very long time we waited in the expectation that Vidvans and Siromanis would combine together to commence the work. But nothing was done. Therefore, our heart was burning; we thought that something must be done: we could not suppress the thought: and it was thus that we were compelled to undertake this work.

Because we have commenced the undertaking, therefore some people think that it is solely our business. But it is not so. It is the common duty of all Pandits to try and foster the growth of Sanskrit. If all remain quiet, what can be done? Therefore the proper attitude is this: that, when one has attempted it, all should extend to him their regard and encouragement: "Why jealousy in serving one's own cause?"

If we were sufficiently wealthy, we would, without expecting a single pie from any quarter, send the magazine free to every Pandit: and we would consider ourselves amply rewarded if Pandits would only condescend to receive and read it. But what can we do? Accursed fate is blind: it cannot see us. Nevertheless, we have fixed a very low subscription. Is there any one in this world nowadays who, for the sake of Sanskrit, cannot spare a Rupee per annum? As long as a man does not recognise that all is Brahman, so long will he think, "He is different from me;" as long as a man does not recognise that the improvement of Sanskrit is the sole aim of our endeavour, so long will he think, "His interests are different from mine." Will this state of things disappear before long?—Perhaps, I am wasting words, My Lord!

"Why need I strive if Thou art active?
How vain my pains if Thou art idle?"]

Our prayers go up to the Almighty that He may endow the Patrika with a long life of devoted service in the cause of Sanskrit, which is also the cause of Hindu life and civilisation.